DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 847 SP 007 818

AUTHOR Duce, Leonard A.
TITLE The Role of the Arts and Sciences in Planning Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE Dec 73
NOTE 8p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; Educational Coordination; *Educational Planning; Foundations of Education; Liberal Arts; Professional Education; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

It is imperative for the arts and sciences to have an integral role in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of teacher education programs on both the local and state level because: a) the arts and sciences are the educational source and cultural depository of the substance of most learning and teaching in our schools; b) they are themselves an educational enterprise which builds on and serves as a source for the public school enterprise; and c) their faculty members share with members of the education faculty the quality of being professionals in the educational enterprise. The arts and sciences have a responsibility to the total educational enterprise which transcends any one professional interest. They are primarily concerned with human values and development, and secondarily with professional development. The role of the arts and sciences in teacher education should be neither supplementary nor subordinate to the role of professional education but complementary to it. (HMD)

LEONARD A. DUCE
December, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 088847

THE ROLE OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES IN PLANNING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In reviewing the controversies which have swirled around the new "Standards for Teacher Education and Certification" in Texas, I have been struck by what Hayakawa would call "the multi-ordinal nature" of the questions in dispute. Their range is wide and their levels of abstraction many. They run the gamut from the specific issues of course content to the general issues of academic freedom and institutional integrity; from the concrete questions of teacher education control in particular institutions to the abstract questions of who should participate--and how they should participate--in setting standards of teacher education for the state as a whole; from the determining of objectives (behavioral or otherwise) for individual courses to the evaluating of programs and program components in terms of some over-all criterion of teaching competency; from the particular, professional needs of the school systems for which institutions of higher education prepare teachers, to the larger, social, economic, political, and cultural needs of society, for which, hopefully, these institutions prepare all of their students; and from the training of teachers in narrowly determined skills which can be quantitatively measured, to the educating of teachers--and all other professionals--

SP 007 815

in those qualitative, human competencies without which professional skills of any sort become mechanical and strangely irrelevant.

Obviously, one cannot express, much less defend, his ideas about these disputed concerns in ten minutes. Therefore, I shall address myself briefly to certain fundamental considerations concerning "The Role of the Arts and Sciences in Planning Teacher Education Programs."

It would be easy to spend our time discussing who is to blame for the lack of communication which is the basic cause of these disputes. That there is a lack of understanding of the new standards cannot be denied--and I might say this lack of understanding characterizes and divides many schools and departments of education, as well as "turning off" many colleges of arts and sciences. Rather than spend my time on this "can of worms," I should like to address myself to certain fundamental, and largely positive, considerations concerning "the Role of Arts and Sciences in Teacher Education." While I can only speak with certainty for myself, I believe I can express the thinking of most of my arts and sciences colleagues on the campuses with which I am familiar.

In the first place, <u>it is imperative that the arts and sciences play an integral role in the planning, implementing,</u>

and evaluating of teacher education programs on both the local, institutional level and the state level. There are many reasons for this assertion; let me suggest just three of them.

1. It is an indisputable fact that the arts and sciences, however organized on our campuses, are the educational source, as well as the cultural depository, of the substance of most learning and teaching in our schools. Regardless of their particular subject-matter concentrations and divisions, arts and sciences are primarily concerned with knowledge and its understanding, with values and their appreciation, with behavior patterns and their evaluation. And are these not what learning and teaching in our schools are really all about? The new standards recognize this fact when they require all teachers to acquire a satisfactory "general education" and a teaching specialty which fits the curriculum requirements of Texas public schools, the first of which comes entirely within the compass of arts and sciences and the second is most likely to be a subject-matter field of the arts and sciences.

2. A second reason why it is imperative that arts and sciences have an integral role in the planning of teacher education is because they are themselves an educational

enterprise which builds on, as well as serving as a source for, the public school enterprise. I call its role, "integral," because it is a two-way street. Arts and Sciences have a stake in teacher education not only because of what they can contribute to it but also because of what they receive ultimately from it. If arts and sciences contribute effectively to the education of teachers for our elementary and secondary schools, those schools in turn will prepare the kind of students who will enhance the quality and advance the level of education afforded by arts and sciences on our campuses. We need, as Dr. Hunter said last night, a new unity in our educational efforts--from kindergarten to graduate and professional schools--a unity which derives not from the domination of one part over the whole but from mutuality and interdependence among all the parts.

3. A third reason for the imperative that arts and sciences should have an integral role in teacher education is that their faculty members share with members of the education faculty the quality of being professionals in the educational enterprise. They too are teachers, some more effectively so than others--as in education faculties and school classrooms--and their teaching, both in substance and in method, will have a profound effect on the attitudes, emphases, and even methods, of those would-be teachers in

their courses. What this adds up to is that the arts and sciences will have a role whether fully recognized or not. Is it not just good sense to recognize that role and to make sure it is integral? The only alternative would be a special general education program and special subject-field programs for teachers, which would be both divisive of the educational enterprise and expensive beyond reason.

In the second place, arts and sciences have a responsibility to the total educational enterprise which transcends any one professional interest--even as important a profession as education itself. Consequently, they cannot violate their academic integrity by surrendering their autonomy to any one professional field, whether medicine, law, or education. Much of the negative reaction to the new standards on the part of my arts and sciences colleagues arises out of the feeling that they threaten this autonomy. The perennial jurisdictional disputes, which have marked--and often marred by mutual recrimination--the programs and standards of teacher education during the past thirty years, are not likely to lessen until the possible misinterpretations of the new standards are eliminated. However, if I understand my colleagues aright, they are more

concerned about the imposition of narrowly technical objectives in courses and programs in arts and sciences--whether behavioral, performance, or competency objectives--than they are about professional oversight of such courses and programs in relation to teacher education.

Consequently, the role of arts and sciences does not involve "cutting" their offerings to fit the needs of the educational profession, but rather to shape them so that these needs--and the needs of all other professional areas to which arts and sciences contribute--will be included in the more comprehensive objectives of the arts and sciences themselves.

Again, such a process can be effectively implemented with reference to teacher education only by a genuinely cooperative effort between arts and sciences faculties and the other professional components of teacher education, and effort in which neither the academic integrity of the former nor the real needs of the latter are compromised. Unfortunately, rightly or wrongly, there is a feeling that the standards as presently set forth do not avoid that compromise for either or both of the parties involved.

Frankly, I am not sure that such compromise is avoided by statements in the standards like, "with cooperative advisement from the academic area department offering

the teaching field" or "Its program of general education is so designed that the teacher education program has a behavioral science base," and by terms such as "basic competencies for the teacher" applied to general education and the teaching specialties.

Now I am fully aware that many faculty members in the arts and sciences have been less than cooperative in teacher education in the past, and I deplore this fact. However, the remedy is not to circumscribe the role of arts and sciences in teacher education, either organizationally or substantively, which would only alienate further the indifferent and disturb unduly the cooperative faculties. Rather, it is to find new ways of working together in the total business of teacher education. Of course, there will be tension--without it there is no life, no improvement, no creativity--but if we really work at it together, it will be constructive rather than destructive tension.

In the third place, and lastly, arts and sciences are, or should be concerned primarily with human values and development and secondarily with professional development. Of course, both the human and the professional are essential for effective teaching and teacher education in our kind of society. We should not and we must not advance <u>either one at the expense of the other</u>. The

academic component should not be so human that it is irrelevant to society's professional requirements and the professional component should not be so vocationally oriented that it ignores society's human and cultural needs. But the converse is equally valid. The academic must not be so "cribbed, cabined, and confined" by vocationally oriented objectives that it cannot perform its human mission and the professional must not be so general that it misses its authentic, vocational goals. In other words, the role of arts and sciences in teacher education should be neither supplementary nor subordinate to the role of professional education, both on the campus and off--but complementary to it. They are two parts of one whole and only together can they guarantee the integrity and the effectiveness of our total <u>educational</u> effort.